



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/784,782 | 02/24/2004 | Jung Gwan Han | YHK-0132 | 2202 |
| 34610 7590 04/01/2008 KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200 | | | | |
| EXAMINER SHERMAN, STEPHEN G | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2629 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 04/01/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Application No. 10/784,782 | Applicant(s) HAN ET AL. |
| Examiner STEPHEN G. SHERMAN | Art Unit 2629 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Amr Awad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Previously dependent claim 7 was amended into claim 1, while dependent claim 15 was amended into claim 9. Thus, claims 2-6, 8, 19 and 21-22 which depended from claim 1 and claims 10-14, 16, 20 and 23-24 which depended from claim 9 have been changed in scope since these claims previously did not require the limitations of claims 7 and 15 respectively. Thus the amendment would require further consideration. Further claims 3 and 27 were also amended.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues the rejection of previous claim 7 (Amended claim 1) on page 11 of the response. The applicant first argues that AAPA and Fukushima cannot be combined and that the Office Action does not provide sufficient motivation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Both AAPA and Fukushima disclose driving methods for a plasma display and one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have realized that one method can be substituted with the other. Not finding motivation DOES NOT imply non-obviousness (See KSR). The applicant further argues that Akiba cannot be combined with AAPA and Fukushima, and also that Akiba does not disclose the asserted features in the Office Action. The examiner disagrees. On page 13, lines 3-7 the applicant states that changing AAPA's pulse DATA would effectively eliminate any address pulse, absent other changes. Well based on the combination of references other changes are made besides just the address pulse, thus there is an expectation of success. Further the applicant states that Akiba does not teach a ground voltage to select on-cells, however, paragraph [0067] states that instead of selecting on cells that off cells could be selected. This means that if off cells are selected that on cells are not, which means that a ground voltage or a zero voltage is used. See Figure 1 of Akiba. The applicant then argues claim 9 for the same reasons as claim 1, and for the same reasons the examiner believes the combination is proper. With respect to claim 25, the applicant argues similarly to claim 1 regarding the combination of references. The applicant specifically states on page 15 that the combined references do not suggest applying data of a first voltage to the address electrode during the reset period. The examiner, however, explained in the rejection that AAPA shows a ground or zero voltage applied to the address electrode during the reset period, and with the combined references, the first voltage is zero or ground, which means that the first voltage is applied during the reset period. The applicant is reminded that the rejection was based upon a combination of references. .